

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims have been neither amended nor canceled. Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112(2):

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(2), second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the term "synchronously" does not render claim 21 indefinite. Examples of support for the term "synchronously" are found in paragraphs [0026] and [0032]. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US Patent No. 6,740,853), claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,740,853) in view of Kanno et al. (U.S. 6,677,167), and claims 8, 9, 11, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,740,853).

With respect to Johnson et al., Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "An electrostatic chuck (ESC) for a wafer comprising: ... a first ring-type sealing member provided on an upper end part of the base; a second ring-type sealing member separately provided on the upper end part of the base, and which divides the wafer into an edge part and a center part when the wafer is mounted," as recited in claim 1

The Office Action sets forth that Johnson et al. discloses, "an electrostatic chuck (ESC) (Abstract & Fig. 1A element 102) for a wafer (Col. 1 lines 13-15 comprising: a base on which the wafer is mountable (Fig. 1A element 170), a first ring-type (Fig. 1A element 370<outer ring>) sealing member (Col. 3 lines 20-25 & Col. 17 lines 20-22<in order to adjust separately the properties of the gas, the two zones need to be sealed from each other>) provided on an upper end part of the base (Fig. 1A elements 170, 160); a second ring-type sealing member (Fig. 1B element 360<inner ring>) separately provided on the upper end part of the base (Fig. 1A elements 170, 360)."

However, as shown in Fig. 1A, Johnson et al.'s electrostatic chuck 102 consists of plates 100, 105, and 110 (col. 10, lines 15-27). Accordingly, Johnson et al.'s electrostatic chuck does not comprise a base 170, coolant channel 360 and coolant channel 370 as asserted in the Office Action. Instead, as shown in Figure 1A, the base 170, coolant channel 360, and coolant

channel 370 are separate from the electrostatic chuck 102.

In addition, coolant channel 370 does not correspond to "a first ring-type sealing member" and coolant channel 360 does not correspond to "a second ring-type sealing member," as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that channels are not ring type sealing members. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Kanno et al does not cure the deficiencies of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Johnson et al. and Kanno et al. taken separately or in combination.

Claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-16 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

With respect to claim 17, the Office Action sets forth that Johnson et al. discloses, "an electrostatic chuck (ESC) ... comprising: ... a plurality of sealing members (Col. 3 lines 20-25 & col. 17 lines 20-22<in order to adjust separately the properties of the gas, the two zones need to be sealed from each other>) mounted on the first surface and which divide the wafer into a plurality of predetermined areas (Col. 9 lines 26-42, Col. 12 lines 5-9 & Fig. 1H <Johnson describes the possibility of having multiple zones of cooling and with different shapes and configurations) when the wafer is mounted on the body."

However, Johnson et al. discloses, "the present invention relates to a stack of elements onto which a substrate ... can be placed ... Each element is hermetically sealed from each other element and from the processing environment" (col. 3, lines 10-23).

Johnson et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a plurality of sealing members mounted on the first surface and which divide the wafer into a plurality of predetermined areas when the wafer is mounted on the body," as recited in claim 17. Johnson et al. does not disclose sealing members mounted on the first surface and which are used to divide a wafer. Johnson et al. is silent on the placement of its hermetic seal. Therefore, claim 17 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Kanno et al does not cure the deficiencies of claim 17. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 17 is patentably distinguishable from Johnson et al. and Kanno et al. taken separately or in combination.

Claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and include all of the features of claim 17. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 18-19 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

With respect to claim 20, the Office Action sets forth that Johnson et al. discloses "providing seals which divide (Col. 3 lines 20-25 & Col. 17 lines 20-22<in order to adjust separately the properties of the gas, the two zones need to be sealed from each other>) the wafer into a plurality of predetermined areas when the wafer is mounted on the body (Fig. 4F)."

However, as discussed above, Johnson et al. is silent on the placement of its hermetic seal. Therefore, claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Kanno et al. does not cure the deficiencies of claim 20. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from Johnson et al. and Kanno et al. taken separately or in combination.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and includes all of the features of claim 20. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 21 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION:

Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 29, 2006

By: Paul F. Daebeler
Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501